REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants have amended the Specification to correct for informalities. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibuya et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,636,082). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection to claim 1 because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a shroud having a face perpendicular to a surface of the disk that regulates air flow generated by rotation of the disk, and opposed to a peripheral edge of the disk. Applicants traverse the rejection to claim 8 because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a spoiler provided in proximity to a boundary between a first area wherein an inner wall of the housing runs side by side with the peripheral edge of the disk and a second area where the distance between the inner wall and peripheral edge becomes longer than in the first area.

Shibuya discloses an interrupting surface 7 that extends radially outward across the tangential plane of a partial wall 2 that passes through an upstream-side end of an opening 6, and extends generally parallel to an arm 5, as shown in FIG. 4 (col. 3, lns. 62-67). The Examiner considers the interrupting surface 7 of Shibuya to be a shroud having a face perpendicular to a surface of the disk that opposes a peripheral edge of the disk. However, Shibuya teaches in Claim 1 an interrupting means wherein a member extends from a downstream edge of an opening of the partition wall 2 in a direction toward a drive chamber. Alternatively, Shibuya teaches an interrupting surface 7 that extends radially outward and

parallel to the arm 5. Shibuya does not teach or suggest forming an interrupting surface 7 that faces a peripheral edge of the disk 1 to regulate airflow generated by rotation of the disk. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 1 is respectfully requested. Claims 5-7 depend from Claim 1, and are considered allowable based on their chain of dependency from independent Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 8, Shibuya discloses a partition wall 2 that includes an opening 9 in which a filter 8 is provided. The Examiner considers the opening 9 of Shibuya as a first area wherein an inner wall of the housing runs side by side with the peripheral edge of the disk, and the area near to the actuator 5 as a second area wherein a distance between the inner wall and the peripheral edge become longer than in the first area. However, the opening 9 as shown in FIG. 1 does not provide an area wherein an inner wall of the housing runs side by side with a peripheral edge of the disk. Since Shibuya fails to teach a spoiler according to Claim 8 of the present invention, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 8.

Claims 2-4 and 9-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Shibuya in view of Leonard et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,885,652). The Examiner does not cite Leonard in the rejection to claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants believe that Leonard taken alone, or in combination, does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 8 for the reasons recited with respect to the §102 rejection of independent claims 1 and 8. Claims 2-4 are dependent from independent Claim 1, and

Claims 9-10 are dependent from independent Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 2-4 and 9-10 are considered allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to the rejection of Claims 1 and 8, and their respective dependency therefrom.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to Claims 11-16 because the cited references do not disclose or suggest, among other things, a disk unit having a first member for regulating airflow generated by dislocation so that airflow is in a rotational direction, and a second member for receiving and regulating the airflow regulated by the first member so as to prevent the airflow from flowing toward an actuator for supporting a head and reads information from or writes information to a disk. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to Claims 17-19 because the cited references do not disclose or suggest, among other things, an airflow-regulating member for regulating airflow generated by disk rotation so as to prevent the airflow from flowing toward the actuator.

With respect to Claim 11, the Examiner considers the spoiler 23 of Shibuya as a second member for receiving and regulating the airflow regulated by the first member of the present invention, and also considers the second member to prevent the airflow from flowing toward the actuator due to the rib 12 of the Leonard reference. However, Leonard discloses that the ribs 12 are provided for directing airflow toward air filters 10 positioned outside the disk 4. Leonard does not disclose or suggest that the ribs 12 prevent airflow from flowing toward an actuator, which is positioned in the head insertion slot 6. Rather, the Leonard reference discloses that air is guided in the direction of the arrows B and C by ribs

11 and directed through air filters 10. (Col. 2, lns. 28-32). Accordingly, as shown in FIGs. 1 and 3 of the Leonard reference, air flows past the insertion slot 6 prior to being filtered by the air filter 10. Therefore, the rib 12 of the Leonard reference does not prevent airflow from flowing toward the actuator, as recited in independent Claim 11.

Additionally, unlike the rib 12 of the Leonard reference, the spoiler 80 (second member) of the present invention softens the collision of the airflow with the actuator 50 by changing the direction of the airflow from the peripheral edge of the disk toward the center of the disk rather than directing airflow toward the outside of the disk as in the Leonard reference. (See Applicants' Specification, pg. 7, lns. 1-37, pg. 8, lns. 1-2). For these reasons, the rejection to Claim 11 is traversed.

Similarly, Claim 17 recites, among other things, an airflow-regulating member for regulating airflow generated by disk rotation so as to prevent the airflow from flowing toward the actuator. Since the Leonard reference fails to disclose or suggest such an airflow-regulating member, the rejection to claim 17 is traversed.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to independent Claims 11 and 17 is respectfully requested. Claims 12-16 are dependent from independent Claim 11, and are considered allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to the rejection of Claim 11. Similarly, Claims 18-19, which depend from independent Claim 17, are considered allowable based on their chain of dependency.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of this application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By Joseph P. Fox
Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760

June 11, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel.: (312) 360-0080
Fax: (312) 360-9315
Customer Number 24978
K:\0941\65715\Amd A.doc